Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin

Leader Emergence: The Case of the Narcissistic Leader

Amy B. Brunell, William A. Gentry, W. Keith Campbell, Brian J. Hoffman, Karl W. Kuhnert and Kenneth G. DeMarree

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://psp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/34/12/1663

Additional services and information for *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://psp.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://psp.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations http://psp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/34/12/1663

Leader Emergence:
The Case of the Narcissistic Leader

Amy B. Brunell
The Ohio State University at Newark

William A. Gentry
W. Keith Campbell
Brian J. Hoffman
Karl W. Kuhnert
University of Georgia

Kenneth G. DeMarree
The Ohio State University

These studies investigate whether individuals with high narcissism scores would be more likely to emerge as leaders during leaderless group discussions. The authors hypothesized that narcissists would emerge as group leaders. In three studies, participants completed personality questionnaires and engaged in four-person leaderless group discussions. Results from all three studies reveal a link between narcissism and leader emergence. Studies 1 and 2 further reveal that the power dimension of narcissism predicted reported leader emergence while controlling for sex, self-esteem, and the Big Five personality traits. Study 3 demonstrates an association between narcissism and expert ratings of leader emergence in a group of executives. The implications of the propensity of narcissists to emerge as leaders are discussed.

Keywords: *narcissism; power; leader emergence; leaderless group discussions*

As far back as the work of Freud (1921, 1931/1950), there has been interest directed toward understanding the role of narcissism in leadership. The interest in narcissism, in part, reflects the apparent contradiction in narcissists as leaders. On one hand, narcissists appear prevalent in leadership roles, such as presidents and chief executive officers (Deluga, 1997; Maccoby, 2000; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006; Wasylyshyn, 2005). On the other hand, the quantitative research on narcissists as leaders suggests that they increase the risk for a host of negative consequences, both for themselves and their organizations (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). For example, narcissism is associated with poor performance ratings from supervisors (Blair, Hoffman, & Helland, 2006), volatile and risky decision making and performance (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2006), counterproductive workplace behavior (Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006; Penney & Spector, 2002), lower contextual performance (Judge et al., 2006), lower peer likability in social organizations (Harms, Wood, & Roberts, 2006), resource destruction (Campbell, Bush, Brunell, & Shelton, 2005), and even white-collar crime (Blickle, Schlegel, Fassbender, & Klein, 2006).

If the behaviors associated with narcissism are also associated with ineffective leadership, why then do narcissists so often rise to positions of leadership and power? One possibility is that narcissists have skills and qualities that are beneficial for becoming leaders but not necessarily beneficial for serving as effective leaders. In other words, narcissism might predict leader emergence but not necessarily leader performance. This state of

affairs, of course, would be inherently problematic in that potentially undesirable leaders assume leadership roles in organizations, bringing along the possibility of disastrous consequences with them (see Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

In this research, we focus directly on narcissism and leader emergence. We ask two primary questions: Are narcissists more likely than others are to emerge as leaders in unacquainted groups? If so, does narcissism predict leadership emergence beyond trait-level personality as measured by the Big Five? Before describing our research in detail, we briefly review the literature on narcissism and on personality and emergent leadership.

NARCISSISM

The term *narcissism* comes from the Greek myth of Narcissus, the story of a man who believed he was so much better than anyone else that he eschewed the love of others. Narcissus eventually fell in love with his own image reflected in a pool of water and died transfixed. Today, researchers use narcissism to describe both a clinical condition and a normal personality trait. In clinical psychology, narcissism is considered a personality (Axis II) disorder. Individuals diagnosed with narcissistic personality disorder (*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders,* Fourth ed., text rev. [DSM-IV-TR]; American Psychiatric Association, 2000) exaggerate their talents and accomplishments and think that they are special and unique. Interpersonally, these individuals are exploitive, arrogant, and lack empathy for others. Narcissistic personality disorder is a very rare disorder, affecting less than 1% of the population according to the *DSM-IV.*

Researchers in the personality psychology tradition, in contrast, view narcissism as an individual difference variable that can be measured in the normal population (for recent reviews, see Campbell, Brunell, & Finkel, 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Furthermore, psychologists have often viewed narcissism as a multidimensional variable (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Kubarych, Deary, & Austin, 2004; Raskin & Terry, 1988). A recent factor analysis (Kubarych et al., 2004) of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988), the most widely used measure of narcissism, revealed that the NPI measures a general narcissism construct with at least two separable, correlated factors measuring power and exhibitionism. Example items assessing the power dimension include "I have a natural talent for influencing people" and "I have a strong will to power." Example items assessing the exhibitionism dimension include "I like to be the center of attention" and "I will usually show off if I get the chance."[1] In this article, we use the term *narcissists* to describe those in the normal population at the high end of the continuum of narcissism scores. Where appropriate, we also investigate the power and exhibitionism dimensions of narcissism.

Narcissism can be conceptualized as containing three basic characteristics: (a) positive and inflated views of the self, (b) a pervasive pattern of self-regulation that maintains positive self-views—often at the expense of others, and (c) interpersonal relationships that lack warmth and intimacy. In terms of having and maintaining positive self-views, narcissists are self-centered (Emmons, 1987), self-focused (Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Shaw, 1988), and self-serving (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998). Narcissists believe that they are more intelligent and attractive than others (Gabriel, Critelli, & Ee, 1994) and judge themselves more favorably than others (John & Robins, 1994). They are overconfident individuals (Campbell, Goodie, & Foster, 2004) who exaggerate their beliefs about their abilities and achievements (John & Robins, 1994) and inflate their own performance in achievement domains (Farwell & Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998). When working with others, they have inflated perceptions about their own positive input while failing to acknowledge the positive input of others (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000; Farwell & Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998; John & Robins, 1994). Narcissists are willing to derogate others to maintain self-esteem (John & Robins, 1994; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993) and aggress against those who provide them with negative feedback (Bushman & Baumeister, 2002).

Narcissists have several additional interpersonal strategies for maintaining self-esteem that go beyond simply controlling others or taking credit from them. For example, narcissists seek the admiration of others (Campbell, 1999; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). They also strive to associate with high-status individuals from whom they can gain status by association—the classic example of this being a trophy spouse (Campbell, 1999). They will brag, show-off and otherwise draw attention to themselves (Buss & Chiodo, 1991), or act in a colorful manner to gain notoriety (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). When there is an opportunity for glory, narcissists will shine, but they will underperform when the opportunity for glory is not available (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002).

As can be gleaned from many of these examples, narcissists, although not generally interested in emotional closeness and intimacy, are typically very socially skilled. Their social relationships often serve the function of self-enhancement rather than to develop intimacy. In other words, narcissists need others to maintain their inflated self-views and have, therefore, developed skills at initiating relationships. For example, narcissists are energetic (Raskin & Terry, 1988), socially extraverted (Oltmanns, Friedman, Fiedler, & Turkheimer, 2003; Paulhus & John, 1998), socially confident (Watson & Biderman, 1994),

and entertaining (Paulhus, 1998). During initial encounters, they are liked by others (Oltmanns et al., 2003; Paulhus, 1998), but this initial liking dissipates over the course of time (Paulhus, 1998), resulting in a pattern where narcissists have more frequent relationships but of shorter duration and less emotional intimacy (e.g., Foster, Shrira, & Campbell, 2006). This pattern can be seen clearly in romantic relationships, where narcissists are initially viewed by their partners as attractive, charming, and fun (Brunell, Campbell, Smith, & Krusemark, 2004). However, narcissists quickly lose their appeal as romantic partners because they lack commitment (Campbell & Foster, 2002) and play games (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002). In short, narcissism from the inside (i.e., from the narcissists' perspective) is about acquiring and maintaining self-esteem, power, and status with little concern for the well-being of others; this is often accomplished through the effective use of social relationships. From the outside, however, narcissists (at least in the short term) will often appear sociable, self-assured, likable, and charming.

PERSONALITY AND EMERGENT LEADERSHIP

A growing body of literature has focused on personality and emergent leadership. In general, those individuals who rise to leadership positions can be described as extraverted, socially skilled, and interpersonally dominant. For example, in their meta-analysis of implicit leadership theories and personality traits, Lord, de Vader, and Alliger (1986) found that masculinity–femininity and dominance predict emergent leadership. Lord and colleagues argued that psychologically masculine individuals are perceived as leaders because they tend to be decisive and dominant, characteristics that are desirable in leadership situations.

A number of researchers have also investigated the Big Five personality traits in relation to emergent leadership. For example, Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) hypothesized that the Big Five personality traits of agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and extraversion are characteristics of people who emerge as leaders from groups. Consistent with this research, Taggar and Hackett (1999) found that conscientiousness, extraversion, and emotional stability were related to emergent leadership. Finally, Judge, Bono, Ilies, and Gerhardt (2002) found that extraversion reliably relates to emergent leadership. They reasoned that extraverts tend to emerge as leaders because their social confidence and skill are important in leadership contexts, which require high levels of social interaction. Thus, extraverts are more likely to be perceived by other group members as group leaders.

Recently, research is emerging to investigate narcissism in organizational contexts (e.g., Judge et al., 2006; Paunonen, Lönnqvist, Verkasalo, Leikas, & Nissinen, 2006). For example, research investigating variables highly associated with narcissism—namely, egotism, manipulativeness, impression management, and self-esteem—reveals that egotism and self-esteem were associated with higher peer ratings of leadership among acquainted groups of military cadets (Paunonen et al., 2006). Manipulativeness and impression management, by contrast, appeared to serve as suppressor variables in predicting leadership. Furthermore, narcissism appears to account for some behaviors above and beyond the Big Five personality traits (Judge et al., 2006).

NARCISSISM AND EMERGENT LEADERSHIP

Given the consistency between several of the characteristics of emergent leaders—namely, extraversion, a desire for dominance, and social skills—and narcissism, it can be argued that narcissists will be more likely to emerge as leaders in novel leaderless groups. There is ample evidence that narcissists are socially extraverted, both from self-reports and peer reports (e.g., Bradlee & Emmons, 1992; Paulhus & John, 1998). There is also a host of evidence that narcissists desire leadership roles. This ranges from their fantasies of power and status (Raskin & Novacek, 1991), scores on need for power as measured by the thematic apperception test (Carroll, 1987), self-reported dominance (Bradlee & Emmons, 1992; Emmons, 1984; Raskin, Novacek, & Hogan, 1991), viewing themselves as leaders in organizations (Judge et al., 2006), and observer-rated dominance (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Finally, narcissists are adept at forming relationships. This is evident from a range of research findings from their likability after 30 seconds of observation (Oltmanns et al., 2003), their success at initiating romantic relationships (Brunell et al., 2004), and their likability during the early stages of interactions with groups of strangers (Paulhus, 1998). In short, narcissists have a confluence of relationship-initiation skills and a desire for social status and power that will theoretically lead to their emerging as leaders in unfamiliar groups. Importantly, narcissists' self-enhancement bias is likely to be most pronounced in situations that are ego involving, such as during leaderless group discussions.

THE PRESENT RESEARCH

Unlike the Paunonen et al. (2006) study, which assesses variables that are highly associated with narcissism, we

TABLE 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Reliability Coefficients, and Intercorrelations Among Study 1 Variables

	M	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Narcissism	0.38	0.14	.81	—												
2. Power (Factor 1)	0.40	0.17	.77	.82**	—											
3. Exhibitionism (Factor 2)	0.40	0.24	.77	.74**	.40**	—										
4. Self-esteem	4.02	0.57	.86	.24**	.27**	.14**	—									
5. Neuroticism	2.86	0.75	.81	–.09†	–.14**	.01	–.48**	—								
6. Extraversion	3.45	0.76	.87	.42**	.37**	.43**	.30**	–.13**	—							
7. Openness to experience	3.63	0.64	.82	.12**	.08	.12**	.02	.10**	.09†	—						
8. Agreeableness	3.72	0.53	.76	–.16**	–.16**	–.06	.35**	–.36**	.10*	.14**	—					
9. Conscientiousness	3.54	0.59	.82	.08	.15**	–.03	.37**	–.10*	.14**	–.05	.24**	—				
10. Desire to lead	4.24	1.59	—	.30**	.30**	.26**	.13**	–.05	.35**	.07	–.04	.12*	—			
11. Self-ratings	4.96	1.10	.90	.25**	.26**	.20**	.12**	–.07	.30**	.09†	.09†	.09†	.61**	—		
12. Group ratings	4.58	1.08	.96	.16**	.18**	.11*	.09†	–.05	.25**	.09†	.04	.04	.44**	.57**	—	
13. Sex (0 = *male*, 1 = *female*)	—	—	—	–.06	–.19**	.11*	–.01	.20**	.16**	.00	.17**	.10*	–.03	.04	.06	—

†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

assess narcissism using a standard and widely used measure of narcissism and examine groups of unacquainted individuals working on a group task. Emergent leadership was assessed from ratings of each individual's contribution to a leaderless group discussion instead of leader ratings among pre-established groups. In three studies, we used groups of four unacquainted individuals. To gain convergent validity for our findings, we assessed emergent leadership in three complementary ways. In Studies 1 and 2, we examined (a) the emergent leadership rating of each member made by the other three members of the group as well as (b) self-ratings of both the desire to lead and of emergent leadership. In Study 3, we used ratings of unbiased expert observers to assess leader emergence of practicing managers. In Study 2, we accounted for leadership effectiveness by investigating performance on the group task.

Our primary hypothesis was that narcissism would predict leadership emergence measured by peer ratings of leadership and self-reported leadership in Studies 1 and 2 and observers' ratings of leadership in Study 3. We further investigated the unique role of narcissism and its dimensions above and beyond self-esteem and the Big Five personality traits. We selected the power and exhibitionism factors described by Kubarych et al. (2004) to gain insight into whether these dimensions are at the heart of the narcissism and leader emergence relationship. Finally, in Study 2, we investigated achieving goals or performance at the task but made no a priori predictions that narcissists would be any better at achieving goals or task performance than the other group members would.

Studies 1 and 2 used undergraduate students and Study 3 used practicing managers enrolled in an executive master's of business administration (EMBA) program. In Study 1, participants were told that they were on a committee to select a director of the student union. Each participant was to advocate for a particular candidate but the end goal was to reach a group consensus to select the best candidate for the job. In Study 2, participants were told that they were shipwrecked and needed to rank a list of items for their survival. Finally, in Study 3, participants assumed the role of a school board deciding how to allocate a large financial contribution from a fictional company.

STUDY 1

Method

Participants. Participants were 432 introductory psychology students who participated in groups of 4 in exchange for partial course credit. Of these participants, 236 were male and 196 were female. Their average age was 19.36 years ($SD = 1.41$).[2]

Procedure. First, participants completed a packet of questionnaires regarding their personality. This packet of questionnaires contained a measure of narcissism, Big Five personality traits, and self-esteem. Means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients for each of these variables are displayed in Table 1.

Narcissism was assessed using the NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988). The NPI is a 40-item, forced-choice measure. Items on the NPI contain a pair of statements (e.g., "I am no better or no worse than most people"; "I think I am a special person"); a score of 1 is assigned to the

narcissistic response and a score of 0 is assigned to the nonnarcissistic response. Scores are averaged across the 40 items; higher scores represent higher levels of trait narcissism. The NPI has adequate reliability and validity and is a commonly used self-report measure of narcissism in normal populations (Raskin & Terry, 1988; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995). For purposes of this investigation, the 3 items assessing leadership were removed from total NPI scores. The 8-item power dimension (e.g., "I have a natural talent for influencing people" and "I have a strong will to power") and the 5-item exhibitionism dimension (e.g., "I really like to be the center of attention" and "I will usually show off if I get the chance") of narcissism were computed by following the two-factor solution described by Kubarych et al. (2004).

The Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999) consists of 44 items and is commonly used to measure neuroticism (e.g., "I see myself as someone who worries a lot"), extraversion (e.g., "I see myself as someone who is talkative"), openness to experience (e.g., "I see myself as someone who is curious about many different things"), conscientiousness (e.g., "I see myself as someone who does a thorough job"), and agreeableness (e.g., "I see myself as someone who is considerate and kind to almost everyone") using 5-point scales, such that 1 = *disagree strongly* and 5 = *agree strongly*. Scores are computed by averaging the items on each subscale; higher scores represent higher levels of each personality trait.

Self-esteem was assessed with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory (Rosenberg, 1965), which contains 10 items that measure global self-esteem (e.g., "I feel like a person who has a number of good qualities"). Items are assessed using 5-point scales, such that 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*. Scores were computed by averaging the 10 items; higher scores represent higher global self-esteem. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory is a valid and commonly used measure of global self-esteem.

After completing the questionnaires, participants were led to another room and seated at desks that were arranged in a circle and labeled with numbers from 1 to 4. Each participant was randomly assigned a number and was seated at the corresponding desk. On each desk was a fictional profile for a candidate running for director of a student union. The participants were told that they were a committee of senior officers of the student union, which arranges concerts, plays, speakers, and movies on campus. The task of the group was to elect next year's director of the program. Qualifications for the new director included leadership; the ability to influence people; being energetic, responsible, and knowledgeable about student interests and affairs; and the ability to coordinate activities.

Throughout all sessions, the profile of candidates was kept constant (e.g., Desk 1 was always given "Karl Baxter"). Each candidate's profile was written in paragraph form on a sheet of paper. Each profile contained an equal number of words and the candidates were rated as equally qualified by a pilot group of 23 participants.

Participants were asked to review the profile on their desks and note which points to make about their candidate in the group discussion. After a few minutes, they were prompted to begin discussing the qualifications of the candidates they represented. They were told that their goal was to convince the committee that their candidate was the best for the position, but at the same time, they all needed to reach a consensus in the selection of the student union director. Following their discussion, the group was instructed to write down the name of the candidate they selected on the ballot left on the table in the center of the circle of desks.

Following their discussion and choice of director of the student union, participants completed a questionnaire regarding their leadership evaluation of themselves and the other group members. Six items measured the extent to which each group member served as a leader for the group's discussion (e.g., "Group member #1 assumed a leadership role in the group"). Respondents rated how accurate each item was for each group member, including themselves, using 7-point scales such that 1 = *very inaccurate* and 7 = *very accurate*. Higher scores revealed higher leader emergence. This scale was used in two important ways. First, we computed the extent to which each group member served as the group's leader as indicated by their peers (Group Rating as Leader). This measure was computed by averaging the three group members' composite leadership score of the individual. Second, we created a score to investigate how much individuals rated themselves as leader (Self-Rating as Leader) by averaging the scores each individual gave himself or herself on the leadership questionnaire.

Another item asked each participant to rate the extent to which they desired to be the leader of the group using a 7-point scale, such that 1 = *not at all* and 7 = *very much*. After completing this questionnaire, all participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.[3]

Results

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics, reliability coefficients, and intercorrelations of the variables assessed in Study 1.

To test our hypothesis, we used a series of multilevel models using the PROC MIXED module of SAS.

TABLE 2: Multilevel Models Predicting Desire to Lead, Self-Ratings of Leadership, and Group Ratings of Leadership (Study 1)

	Desire to Lead (N = 430)		*Self-Rating* (N = 431)		*Other Rating* (N = 431)	
Independent Variable	*Coefficient (SE)*	*t Value (df)*	*Coefficient (SE)*	*t Value (df)*	*Coefficient (SE)*	*t Value (df)*
Model 1						
Narcissism	3.11 (.52)	5.99 (425)***	1.77 (.36)	4.88 (427)***	0.81 (.35)	2.31 (383)*
Sex[a]	–0.03 (.15)	0.21 (405)	0.12 (.10)	1.12 (409)	0.19 (.10)	2.01 (327)*
Self-esteem	0.15 (.13)	1.15 (425)	0.12 (.09)	1.33 (425)	0.16 (.09)	1.73 (407)†
Model 2						
Narcissism	1.68 (.57)	2.94 (420)**	1.25 (.40)	3.11 (422)**	0.27 (.40)	0.68 (396)
Sex[a]	–0.20 (.15)	1.29 (394)	–0.01 (.11)	0.13 (405)	0.11 (.10)	1.05 (326)
Self-esteem	–0.06 (.16)	0.40 (421)	–0.08 (.11)	0.69 (421)	0.02 (.11)	0.17 (399)
Extraversion	0.60 (.11)	5.61 (416)***	0.33 (.08)	4.35 (421)***	0.27 (.07)	3.65 (374)***
Agreeableness	–0.19 (.17)	1.18 (421)	0.19 (.12)	1.62 (419)	0.05 (.12)	0.45 (410)
Conscientiousness	0.25 (.13)	1.94 (416)†	0.07 (.09)	0.74 (421)	0.02 (.09)	0.26 (379)
Neuroticism	–0.03 (.12)	0.28 (421)	–0.02 (.08)	0.20 (420)	–0.06 (.08)	0.68 (405)
Openness	0.10 (.12)	0.88 (408)	0.07 (.08)	0.88 (417)	0.12 (.08)	1.52 (357)
Model 3						
Power	1.17 (.51)	2.28 (419)*	1.21 (.36)	3.36 (421)***	0.71 (.35)	2.02 (390)*
Exhibitionism	0.60 (.35)	1.72 (420)†	0.14 (.25)	0.58 (420)	–0.19 (.24)	0.78 (401)
Sex[a]	–0.18 (.16)	1.12 (389)	0.03 (.11)	0.31 (400)	0.15 (.11)	1.44 (319)
Self-esteem	–0.07 (.16)	0.46 (420)	–0.09 (.11)	0.82 (420)	–0.00 (.11)	0.02 (401)
Extraversion	0.56 (.11)	5.04 (415)***	0.31 (.08)	3.97 (420)***	0.26 (.08)	3.44 (376)***
Agreeableness	–0.18 (.17)	1.07 (420)	0.22 (.12)	1.87 (420)†	0.09 (.12)	0.74 (404)
Conscientiousness	0.25 (.13)	1.87 (414)†	0.04 (.09)	0.44 (420)	–0.00 (.09)	0.05 (375)
Neuroticism	–0.03 (.12)	0.26 (420)	–0.01 (.08)	0.08 (419)	–0.04 (.08)	0.53 (403)
Openness	0.10 (.12)	0.86 (409)	0.07 (.08)	0.87 (417)	0.12 (.08)	1.48 (360)

NOTE: Coefficient values are γ coefficients, which are analogous to an unstandardized regression coefficient. Because we used the Satterthwaite method for computing degrees of freedom, degrees of freedom vary from predictor to predictor and from model to model. Thus, significance tests are reported using test-specific degrees of freedom.
a. Sex: 0 = *male*; 1 = *female*.
†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. **$p < .001$.

Multilevel modeling is ideal for our data structure because we had 432 participants nested into 108 groups. Multilevel modeling allows us to take into account group membership and, with it, any nonindependence of responses from members of a given group (e.g., see Kenny, Mannetti, Pierro, Livi, & Kashy, 2002). Taking into account group membership also allows us to compute accurate degrees of freedom and to partition out between-groups error variance. Using PROC MIXED, we used the personality variables assessed prior to the group discussion to predict the dependent variables assessed following the group discussion. These models used the Satterthwaite method for calculating degrees of freedom; because of this, degrees of freedom vary from variable to variable in a given model. Multilevel modeling provides us with a γ coefficient, which is analogous to an unstandardized beta in regression. We allowed intercepts to vary from group to group, but because of the large number of variables relative to the number of participants in each group, we did not allow for between-groups variability in the slopes. In each of our analyses, we predicted the dependent variables from grand mean–centered predictors (Hayes, 2006). Results are summarized in Table 2.

First, we tested whether narcissism predicted leader emergence while controlling for sex and self-esteem. For each of our dependent variables (desire to lead, self-rated leadership, and group-rated leadership), narcissism was a significant predictor but sex and self-esteem were not.

Second, we included self-reports of the Big Five traits in the analysis to determine whether narcissism contributed unique effects beyond the Big Five. These analyses, also summarized in Table 2, revealed that narcissism remained positively and significantly associated with both the desire to lead and self-ratings of leadership. However, it was no longer significantly associated with group ratings of leadership.

Third, as narcissism has been described as a multidimensional variable (e.g., Kubarych et al., 2004; Raskin & Terry, 1988), we replicated this analysis using the recently published two-factor structure (Kubarych et al., 2004) investigating the power factor and the exhibitionism factor of narcissism while controlling for self-esteem, the

TABLE 3: Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Study 2 Variables

	M	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Narcissism	0.40	0.17	.85	—													
2. Power (Factor 1)	0.46	0.22	.79	.84**	—												
3. Exhibitionism (Factor 2)	0.38	0.26	.76	.79**	.46**	—											
4. Self-esteem	4.06	0.56	.86	.41**	.32**	.29**	—										
5. Neuroticism	2.83	0.75	.81	−.15**	−.13**	−.08†	−.46**	—									
6. Extraversion	3.50	0.81	.89	.57**	.46**	.48**	.41**	−.20	—								
7. Openness to experience	3.57	0.60	.80	.25**	.15**	.26**	.15**	−.09†	.17**	—							
8. Agreeableness	3.76	0.51	.75	−.05	−.15**	−.01	.33**	−.38**	.14**	.25**	—						
9. Conscientiousness	3.57	0.60	.79	.08	.11*	−.04	.39**	−.05	.14**	.02	.25**	—					
10. Desire to lead	4.44	1.34	—	.37**	.32**	.33**	.19**	−.04	.28**	.16**	.04	.16**	—				
11. Self-ratings	5.26	0.96	.92	.30**	.30**	.19**	.23**	−.03	.26**	.16**	.12*	.13**	.56**	—			
12. Group ratings	3.05	0.72	.89	.08†	.11*	.05	−.09†	.04	.02	.03	−.12*	−.12*	.08	.23**	—		
13. Individual effectiveness	49.40	10.43	—	.01	.03	−.02	.02	−.11*	−.01	−.04	−.01	.05	.08†	.11†	−.11*	—	
14. Group effectiveness	45.22	8.11	—	.01	−.04	.04	.05	−.04	.02	.01	−.06	.02	.01	.01	−.01	.27**	—
15. Sex[a]	—	—	—	−.14**	−.21**	−.02	−.05	.27**	.11*	−.06	.06	.09†	.08†	−.04	−.07	−.50	.06

a. Sex: 0 = *male*; 1 = *female*.
†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Big Five traits, and sex. These analyses, summarized in Table 2, revealed different patterns of results for each of the two factors. Specifically, the exhibitionism factor was not significantly associated with any of the leader emergence variables, whereas the power dimension was positively and significantly associated with all three leader emergence variables, including group ratings of leadership.[4]

Getting one's candidate elected. We next investigated whether narcissism would predict achieving the goal of getting one's candidate elected as director of the student union. Logistic regression was conducted using narcissism, self-esteem, and sex as predictors. None of these variables were statistically significant. When this analysis was repeated using two separate factors (power and exhibitionism) instead, again none of the variables were statistically significant. Thus, narcissists did not appear to be more successful advocates for their candidates.

STUDY 2

Study 1 demonstrated that narcissism predicted leader emergence during the student union committee task. The nature of the task allowed us to investigate the extent to which narcissists would be perceived as leaders and whether they would be better advocates for their candidates, but it did not allow us to assess actual task performance because there was no correct answer to the group task and, therefore, no index of group performance. This is important because narcissism might be linked to better performance and that, in turn, might predict leader emergence. Study 2 was conducted to enable us to investigate narcissism and emergent leadership in a context in which we could assess both individual and group performance. Study 2 had the additional benefit of providing an opportunity to replicate Study 1 with a different task.

Method

Participants. Participants were 408 introductory psychology students who participated in groups of 4 in exchange for partial course credit. Of these participants, 129 were male and 278 were female. Their average age was 19.22 years ($SD = 1.20$). One person failed to provide demographic information.[5]

Procedure. Participants first completed the packet of questionnaires regarding their personality described in Study 1. Means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients for these measures are displayed in Table 3. After completing the questionnaires, participants were led to another room and seated at desks that were arranged in a circle. On each desk was a packet entitled "Narg Island—The Situation," which is a description of a shipwreck (Project IDEELS, n.d.). Participants were told to imagine that they are aboard the ship and that the captain of the ship is unconscious. They are also given a description of the Narg Island habitat and a list of 15 salvageable items that the group was able to gather from the boat or remains from the wreckage. First, each participant individually ranked the 15 items according to their importance for survival. Next, they were asked to compare their responses to those of the other group members and to reach a group decision about the ranking of the salvageable items.

TABLE 4.   Multilevel Models Predicting Desire to Lead, Self-Ratings of Leadership, and Group Ratings of Leadership (Study 2)

Independent Variable	Desire to Lead (N = 403)		Self-Rating (N = 407)		Other Rating (N = 406)	
	Coefficient (SE)	t Value (df)	Coefficient (SE)	t Value (df)	Coefficient (SE)	t Value (df)
Model 1						
Narcissism	2.88 (.41)	7.05 (379)***	1.46 (.30)	4.90 (395)***	0.62 (.23)	2.73 (373)**
Sex[a]	–0.11 (.14)	0.79 (394)	0.00 (.10)	0.02 (399)	–0.12 (.08)	1.57 (392)
Self-esteem	0.11 (.12)	0.88 (390)	0.20 (.09)	2.28 (400)*	–0.20 (.07)	2.96 (385)**
Model 2						
Narcissism	2.36 (.50)	4.70 (383)***	1.25 (.37)	3.41 (394)***	0.33 (.28)	1.16 (377)
Sex[a]	–0.26 (.15)	1.75 (387)†	–0.12 (.11)	1.14 (393)	–0.11 (.08)	1.38 (384)
Self-esteem	–0.03 (.15)	0.20 (371)	0.17 (.11)	1.55 (388)	–0.14 (.08)	1.71 (363)†
Extraversion	0.20 (.10)	2.04 (384)*	0.09 (.07)	1.29 (394)	0.05 (.06)	0.89 (378)
Agreeableness	0.06 (.15)	0.40 (390)	0.21 (.11)	1.95 (387)†	0.18 (.08)	2.12 (390)*
Conscientiousness	0.27 (.12)	2.30 (389)*	0.07 (.09)	0.90 (391)	–0.05 (.07)	0.73 (388)
Neuroticism	0.11 (.10)	1.08 (386)	0.18 (.08)	2.38 (394)*	–0.02 (.06)	0.33 (380)
Openness	0.11 (.11)	1.02 (375)	0.08 (.08)	1.03 (391)	0.05 (.06)	0.84 (370)
Model 3						
Power	1.02 (.36)	2.79 (380)**	1.04 (.26)	3.94 (390)***	0.41 (.20)	2.03 (370)*
Exhibitionism	1.04 (.30)	3.43 (380)***	–0.03 (.22)	0.13 (391)	–0.08 (.17)	0.47 (374)
Sex[a]	–0.26 (.15)	1.78 (386)†	–0.08 (.11)	0.80 (393)	–0.09 (.08)	1.11 (381)
Self-esteem	–0.01 (.15)	0.09 (372)	0.20 (.11)	1.83 (386)†	–0.14 (.08)	1.68 (363)†
Extraversion	0.19 (.10)	1.92 (383)†	0.11 (.07)	1.54 (393)	0.05 (.06)	0.86 (377)
Agreeableness	0.09 (.15)	0.60 (389)	0.26 (.11)	2.38 (388)*	–0.15 (.08)	1.79 (389)†
Conscientiousness	0.29 (.12)	2.38 (387)*	0.03 (.09)	0.36 (392)	–0.07 (.07)	0.98 (385)
Neuroticism	0.12 (.10)	1.13 (385)	0.19 (.07)	2.57 (393)*	–0.01 (.06)	0.25 (378)
Openness	0.10 (.11)	0.90 (374)	0.10 (.08)	1.24 (388)	0.06 (.06)	0.92 (368)

NOTE: Coefficient values are the γ coefficients, which are analogous to an unstandardized regression coefficient. Because we used the Satterthwaite method for computing degrees of freedom, degrees of freedom vary from predictor to predictor and from model to model. Thus, significance tests are reported using test-specific degrees of freedom.
†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.
[a] Sex: 0 = male; 1 = female.

Following their discussion, participants completed the leadership evaluation that was described in Study 1. Again, we computed how much each individual was rated as leader by the other group members (Group Ratings as Leader) by averaging leadership ratings of the three partners' composite leadership scores of the individual. We then created a measure to investigate how much individuals rated themselves as leader (Self-Ratings as Leader) by averaging the individual's scores on the leadership questionnaire.

A final item asked each participant to rate the extent to which he or she desired to be the leader of the group using a 7-point scale, such that 1 = *not at all* and 7 = *very much*. After completing this questionnaire, all participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.[6]

Results

Table 3 displays the descriptive statistics, reliability coefficients, and intercorrelations of the variables assessed in Study 2. To test our hypotheses, we used narcissism to predict the desire to lead, self-ratings of leadership, and group ratings of leadership. As described in Study 1, we used multilevel modeling to test our hypotheses.

First, we tested whether narcissism predicted leader emergence while controlling for sex and self-esteem (see Table 4). For each of our dependent variables (desire to lead, self-rated leadership, and group-rated leadership), narcissism was a significant predictor but sex was not. Self-esteem produced mixed results, with a positive relationship to self-rated leadership and a negative relationship to group-rated leadership.

Second, we included self-reports of the Big Five traits in the analysis to determine whether narcissism contributed unique effects beyond the Big Five. These analyses, also summarized in Table 4, revealed that narcissism remained positively and significantly associated with both the desire to lead and self-ratings of leadership. However, it was no longer significantly associated with group ratings of leadership.

We next replicated this analysis using the two-factor structure of narcissism described in Study 1 while controlling for self-esteem, the Big Five traits, and sex. This analysis is summarized in Table 4. The two factors of narcissism showed a different pattern of results. As in Study 1, the power dimension was positively and significantly associated with all three leader emergence variables. The exhibitionism factor was only significantly associated with the desire to lead.[7]

Individual effectiveness and group performance. Is narcissism linked to better individual and group performance on the task? Individual and group performance were computed by comparing individual and group rankings to expert rankings on the Narg Island task. According to Project IDEELS, the expert was a senior instructor at the elite Norwegian Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape School. He has experience teaching courses on survival in the northern Scandinavian climate to the U.S. Army Rangers, U.S. Army Airborne Division, U.S. Navy SEALs, Canadian Winter Warfare Unit, British Royal Marines, and various other European NATO elite units. To compute performance rankings, we first calculated the absolute value of the difference between the individual rankings and expert rankings for all 15 items. These values were then summed. This procedure was repeated for group rankings. Higher scores reflect lower performance.

First, individual-level performance was regressed on narcissism, self-esteem, and sex.[8] Neither narcissism, $\beta = -.001$, $t(398) = -0.02$, $p = ns$, nor self-esteem, $\beta = .02$, $t(398) = 0.37$, $p = ns$, predicted individual-level performance. Sex was also not statistically significant, $\beta = -.05$, $t(398) = -0.95$, $p = ns$. Thus, narcissism was not linked to performance. When this analysis was repeated with power and exhibitionism instead of overall narcissism scores, none of the variables were statistically significant.

To investigate group performance, several group-level variables were created: average narcissism in the group, average power in the group, average exhibitionism in the group, average self-esteem in the group, and percentage of males in the group. First, we regressed group performance on average narcissism scores, average self-esteem scores, and the percentage of males in the group. Average narcissism was not significant, $\beta = -.02$, $t(98) = -0.20$, $p = ns$. Average self-esteem was also not significant, $\beta = .11$, $t(98) = 1.01$, $p = ns$. Finally, the percentage of males in the group was also not significant, $\beta = -.15$, $t(98) = -1.49$, $p = ns$. When this analysis was repeated with group-level power and exhibitionism instead of group-level narcissism scores, none of the variables were statistically significant. Thus, group-level narcissism does not appear to predict group performance on the task.

STUDY 3

Taken together, Studies 1 and 2 provide evidence that narcissism predicts leader emergence. Furthermore, both studies provided strong evidence that the power dimension in particular predicts leader emergence above and beyond other important variables, including the Big Five personality variables, self-esteem, and sex.

The primary limitation of these studies is the nature of the sample. Although student samples are ideal for conducting controlled theoretical research, there is a significant question of the external validity of the findings for actual organizational leaders. Thus, Study 3 used a leaderless group discussion among practicing managers enrolled in an executive MBA program to investigate leadership emergence. Furthermore, Study 3 used an alternate measure to evaluate leader emergence (i.e., expert ratings) that complement those used in Studies 1 and 2. Because these data were obtained from an existing data set collected at an executive assessment center, different personality questionnaires were used in data collection. In addition, because group membership data were not available for this sample, we were unable to use multilevel modeling for analyses.

Method

Participants. Participants were 153 managers enrolled in different divisions of an executive MBA (EMBA) program at a large southeastern university between the years of 2002 and 2005. Specifically, managers enrolled in senior EMBA and physicians EMBA program served as participants in this study. While enrolled in the EMBA program, the participants concurrently worked as managers in a diverse range of organizations and industries. The majority of participants were Caucasian (82%) males (68%) with a mean age of 44, 11.3 years of managerial experience, and responsibility for supervising 10 direct reports on average.

Procedure. Rather than assessing narcissism with the NPI used in Studies 1 and 2, participants completed the narcissism scale (Wink & Gough, 1990) of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI; Gough & Bradley, 1992) prior to beginning the EMBA program. As with the NPI, this scale was developed to capture narcissism in normal populations and has been validated with related self-report scales (Wink & Gough, 1990). The narcissism index includes items that assess authority, inflated self-views, and attention seeking.[9] CPI narcissism does not contain any explicit leadership items. Respondents answer "true" or "false" for each of the 49 items. A score of 1 is assigned to the narcissistic response and a score of 0 is assigned to the nonnarcissistic response. Scores are summed across the 49 items; higher scores represent higher levels of narcissism.

Finally, we could not assess narcissism while controlling for the entire CPI (comparable to controlling the Big Five in Studies 1 and 2) because the narcissism scale was derived from the CPI. Instead, we aimed to control for extraversion because this was the Big Five factor with the largest role in leadership emergence in Study 1

TABLE 5:   Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Study 3 Variables

	M	SD	α	*Narcissism*	*Sociability*	*Expert Ratings*
Narcissism	24.66	5.98	.72	—		
Sociability	53.85	7.87	.77	.29**	—	
Expert ratings	4.4	1.3	—	.20**	.12	—
Sex[a]	—	—	—	–.24**	.05	–.12

a. Sex: 0 = *male*; 1 = *female*.
**p < .01.

and in past research. As a proxy for extraversion, we used the CPI's sociability scale, which correlates quite strongly with other measures of extraversion such as the Comrey Personality Scales ($r = .70$) and Costa and McCrae's (1992) NEO ($r = .59$). According to Gough and Bradley (1992), individuals high in sociability are described as outgoing and talkative. Respondents answer "true" or "false" for each of the 32 items. A score of 1 is assigned to the sociable response and a score of 0 is assigned to the nonsociable response. Scores are summed across the 32 items; higher scores represent higher sociability.

After completing the CPI measures, the participants engaged in a leaderless group discussion designed to provide the participants with feedback concerning their leadership skills. Specifically, participants were placed in meeting rooms in groups of 4 and given a packet of materials for the discussion. The participants were instructed that they were to assume the role of a school board attempting to decide how to allocate a large financial contribution from a fictional company. The participants then had 1 hour to review the materials before the group would convene to discuss their allocation decisions. Once convened, the group was allotted 1 hour to reach a consensus about how to best allocate the financial gift.

Trained raters observed the group meetings in order to provide the participants with feedback about their leadership skills. Each rater was an industrial/organizational psychology doctoral student or professor and received approximately 20 hours of rater training. To measure emergent leadership, two trained observers provided ratings of the extent to which each participant served as a leader for the group's discussion. The behaviorally anchored rating scale ranged from 1 = *no behaviors directed toward leading the group to a decision* to 8 = *controlled all aspects of the group's decision making process and final allocation decision*. The two raters' emergent leadership ratings were strongly correlated ($r = .90$) and, thus, were aggregated into a single measure of emergent leadership for each participant.

Results

Table 5 displays the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the variables assessed in Study 3.

Does narcissism predict leader emergence? To replicate and extend the findings of the previous two studies using a sample of managers, we first regressed emergent leadership ratings on narcissism scores and sex. As predicted, narcissism significantly predicted leadership emergence ratings made by expert observers, $\beta = .20$, $t(150) = 2.41$, $p < .05$. Sex did not predict leader emergence, $\beta = -.07$, $t(150) = -0.92$, $p = ns$. When sociability was added to the model, narcissism remained significant, $\beta = .17$, $t(149) = 2.00$, $p < .05$, whereas sociability was not statistically significant, $\beta = .07$, $t(149) = 0.88$, $p = ns$.[10]

GENERAL DISCUSSION

We conducted three studies to investigate the role of narcissism in emergent leadership and specifically to determine whether narcissists are more likely to emerge as leaders during leaderless group discussions. Consistent with our hypotheses, narcissism predicted emergent leadership across all studies. This was true in groups of strangers consisting of both undergraduates and business executives. This was also true whether leadership emergence was self-reported, reported by others in the group, or assessed by expert observers.

We expanded on this basic pattern of findings in two directions. First, we replicated the effects controlling for self-reported scores on all of the Big Five traits (Studies 1 and 2) and CPI sociability (Study 3). In the first two studies, the narcissism to emergent leadership link remained significant on two outcome variables (the desire to lead and self-reported leadership), but not with the group reports of leadership. In particular, the inclusion of self-reported extraversion appeared to relate to the group reports of leadership in Study 1. In Study 3, the narcissism to emergent leadership link remained significant even when controlling for CPI sociability.

Second, in Studies 1 and 2, we assessed the link between narcissism and leader emergence using two separate factors of narcissism—power and exhibitionism. The exhibitionism factor played relatively little role in emergent leadership but the power component played a significant role. Indeed, across both Studies 1 and 2,

the power factor of the NPI predicted the desire to lead, self-reported leadership, and group reports of leadership even when controlling for sex, self-esteem, and the entire Big Five. Exploratory analyses also demonstrated the robustness of the power factor in Study 3. Thus, the power factor of narcissism appears to be a reliable and relatively unique predictor of emergent leadership. Furthermore, this analysis revealed that at the center of the relationship between narcissism and leadership is power acquisition but not attention seeking. One reason that the power dimension had predictive value but the exhibitionism dimension did not (at least when controlling for the Big Five) may be that the Big Five captures social extraversion to a greater extent than power or dominance do and, therefore, controls for the exhibitionism component to a greater extent than the power component. Nevertheless, the independent predictive role of the power dimension suggests that narcissistic leadership could be expected to emerge in the absence of public attention (i.e., a context that pulls for attention seeking). Narcissistic leadership should not be conceptualized primarily as an attention-seeking exercise.

One question that remains is how do narcissists emerge as leaders? Given the significant association between narcissism and extraversion, one can speculate that narcissists' social extraversion works to their advantage, at least when being evaluated by peers. In other words, when the discussion begins, narcissists are likely to speak up frequently and assert their opinions more forcefully than others in the group are. Because of these social skills, narcissists' peers may perceive them as the leaders of the group. However, because the effects of narcissism (and especially the power subscale) on leader emergence remained after controlling for extraversion, extraversion alone doesn't seem to explain our findings. One other possible mechanism by which narcissism might affect leader emergence deals with the overconfidence often exhibited by narcissists (Campbell et al., 2004) and especially those high in power (see Briñol, Petty, Valle, Rucker, & Becerra, 2007). Confidence in their opinions might increase the likelihood that narcissists will speak up in the group discussion because confidence is one factor that affects whether a person will act on a belief (Tormala & Rucker, 2007). Furthermore, in addition to increasing the likelihood that they will speak their opinion, the confidence exhibited by narcissists might cause their group members to perceive them as competent and effective.

An interesting pattern of results emerged with respect to the relationship between narcissism and leader effectiveness. In contrast to the consistent relationships between narcissism and leader emergence across the

studies, narcissism was unrelated to performance in Study 2. Narcissists were no better than other group members were at ranking the salvageable items for survival. This is not particularly surprising; narcissists may have inflated views of their intelligence (Gabriel et al., 1994), but other research shows no correlation between narcissism and general knowledge (Campbell et al., 2004).

Unfortunately, there is a dearth of research exploring the relationship between narcissism and leadership. However, there are two noteworthy exceptions. First, Judge et al. (2006) found that narcissists believed that their contextual performance was greater than their supervisors did. Second, Blair et al. (2006) demonstrated that narcissism was unrelated to supervisor ratings of administrative or conceptual competence and negatively related to ratings of interpersonal facilitation. These results suggest that narcissism has a negative impact on leader performance when performance is operationalized as interpersonal facilitation. Importantly, the effectiveness measures in these studies (e.g., initial ranking of item desirability) appear to be a function of administrative or conceptual competence rather than of interpersonal facilitation. In addition, it is likely that the short duration of a leaderless group discussion does not allow for any ill effects of narcissism to adversely affect a leader's performance. However, research shows that narcissists are liked in the short term but become less likable over time in the eyes of their peers (Paulhus, 1998). Furthermore, research on narcissism in the workplace illustrates that the ill effects of narcissism eventually do come to pass (e.g., Blair et al., 2006; Judge et al., 2006; Penney & Spector, 2002). Thus, it is reasonable to expect that the group's view of the narcissistic leader would diminish over time as well and that the leadership of the narcissist is short-lived. Taken together, it appears that the link between narcissism and leadership is complex and more research is needed.

Limitations and Future Directions

There are two apparent limitations in our set of studies. First, there is a possible confound in common method variance. Although we did obtain "other" ratings of leader emergence, which was our primary outcome variable, our other measures were all self-report. Thus, there exists the possibility that our findings reflect same-source or common-method variance. However, the measures of personality were different, which suggests that this may not have been a major limitation. Importantly, a very similar pattern of results was found across the three studies using different instruments, ameliorating any major concern over common-method variance.

Second, the exercises used in this study may not be representative of work in an organizational context. Although Study 3 comes closer to an actual organizational context by investigating experienced managers taking courses in MBA programs, future research should use an organizational context to determine whether narcissists emerge in a leaderless group context in the workplace, where the stakes may be high. Because of the lack of research in applied settings focusing on narcissism in the workplace, and on leadership in particular, it is important to conduct additional research in order to increase our knowledge and understanding of narcissism in these contexts.

Implications

This research adds an important piece of data to the growing body of research on narcissists' social lives and self-regulation strategies (e.g., Campbell et al., 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). It is clear that narcissism predicts seeking leadership positions, which are able to confer social status and dominance to the narcissist (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). What is particularly interesting, however, is that the strategy actually works insomuch as narcissism—in particular the power factor—predicts others' perception of leadership. Given past research on narcissists' (somewhat negative or risky) leadership performance, the pattern one would expect in narcissists' leadership effectiveness across time and situations is volatile. Narcissists would rise to leadership quickly and often but also fail in time, potentially leading to subsequent leadership emergence efforts. These long-term patterns of narcissists' leadership would be a fascinating topic for future research.

This work also illustrates the value of investigating narcissism as a multidimensional construct. In our analysis, the power dimension of narcissism provided a unique explanatory contribution above and beyond several other variables, including self-esteem and the Big Five personality traits. If this was the case within the context of investigating leadership, it is likely to be the case when investigating other social behaviors as well. More research needs to be done to better understand the construct of narcissism.

The key practical implication of this study is that narcissism, a trait that is linked to a range of potential leadership problems, from risky decision making (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2006) to white-collar crime (Blickle et al., 2006), actually predicts leader emergence. In other words, the same characteristic that facilitates an individual's emergence as a leader can also make this person a potentially destructive leader.

Practically speaking, there are two possibilities for addressing this issue. First, narcissism could be assessed in the systems designed to assess organizational managers. This would allow organizations to identify narcissists before they assume a leadership role. However, the findings of Study 3 are somewhat discouraging in this regard. That is, the method used in Study 3, in which objective raters provided ratings on a leaderless group discussion, is similar to the typical methodology taken by a popular assessment tool, the assessment center. Our findings indicate that even trained raters tend to perceive more narcissistic individuals as group leaders. If this is consistently the case, these findings suggest that assessment centers will possibly be responsible for the advancement of narcissists in organizations. Clearly, future research on the relationship between narcissism and performance in assessment centers is warranted.

In addition, efforts could be made to place checks on narcissistic leaders to minimize the risk factors associated with narcissism, such as white-collar crime (Blickle et al., 2006), a lack of integrity (Blair et al., 2006), and workplace deviance (Judge et al., 2006). For example, a leader with narcissistic traits might be restrained from making overly risky decisions or using clever accounting to inflate performance. At the level of CEO, these processes suggest having a strong and involved corporate board or truly independent auditing of the corporate books. At the level of the more typical leader within the organization, however, it would include more detailed checks on behavior such as performance reports or 360-degree multirater feedback.

Conclusion

Our findings suggest that narcissists reliably emerge as leaders in unacquainted groups. Unfortunately, previous research suggests that narcissistic leaders have the potential to bring a host of problems to an organization. Coping with this somewhat paradoxical state of affairs is an important goal for organizations. It is our hope that these studies will stimulate additional inquiry into the implications of narcissism for leadership to aid in developing approaches to deal with this potentially problematic issue.

NOTES

1. Kubarych, Deary, and Austin (2004) reported that there is no agreed-upon factor structure for the Narcissism Personality Inventory and that the well-known structures (i.e., Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988) are problematic because items load on inappropriate dimensions (e.g., Raskin & Terry's, 1988, self-sufficiency dimension contains items that assess superiority, authority, and entitlement; Emmons's, 1987, leadership/authority dimension assesses vanity or exhibitionism) and frequently have low reliability coefficients (e.g., $\alpha <$ .50 for Raskin & Terry's, 1988, entitlement subscale). Furthermore, the

power and exhibitionism dimensions tie in with our theoretical perspective that narcissists are driven to power and like to get attention and show off. Finally, the power and exhibitionism dimensions fit in with Rosenthal and Pittinsky's (2006) description of the downside of narcissistic leaders, which includes arrogance as well as the insatiable need for recognition and superiority.

2. Sex composition of groups was determined randomly.

3. Not all participants completed all materials. Specifically, data were missing from 2 participants who failed to complete the measure of desire to lead and from 1 participant each on self-rated and group-rated leadership.

4. The sex composition of the group did not appreciably change the results reported.

5. Sex composition of groups was determined randomly.

6. Not all participants completed all materials. Specifically, data were missing from 5 participants who failed to complete the measure of the desire to lead, 1 participant on self-rated leadership, and 2 participants on group-rated leadership. In addition, 1 participant failed to complete all personality measures, 1 participant failed to complete all agreeableness items, and 2 participants failed to complete all narcissism items.

7. The sex composition of the group did not appreciably change the results reported.

8. Data from 3 participants are missing because they failed to properly complete the task.

9. Because the California Psychological Inventory is empirically keyed, copy written, and used in applied contexts for personnel selection, test security is an important issue. For these reasons, we do not provide sample items of the California Psychological Inventory in the manuscript.

10. To explore power and exhibitionism in this study, two authors independently rated items for power and exhibitionism. Interrater agreement was 85%; disagreements were resolved through discussion. For the power dimension, $\alpha = .58$; for the exhibitionism dimension, $\alpha = .50$. Despite these low alpha values, we continued with analyses for exploratory purposes. Regression analyses were conducted with power and exhibitionism in the place of narcissism. In this analysis, the power dimension was statistically significant, $\beta = .20$, $t(149) = 2.22$, $p < .05$, whereas the exhibitionism dimension was not, $\beta = -.05$, $t(149) = -0.51$, $p = ns$. Sociability was also not statistically significant, $\beta = .06$, $t(149) = 0.67$, $p = ns$.

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text rev.). Washington, DC: Author.

Blair, C. A., Hoffman, B. J., & Helland, K. R. (2006, August). *Narcissism in organizations: An empirical look at managerial integrity and effectiveness*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Blickle, G., Schlegel, A., Fassbender, P., & Klein, U. (2006). Some personality correlates of business white-collar crime. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 55, 220-233.

Bradlee, P. M., & Emmons, R. A. (1992). Locating narcissism within the interpersonal circumplex and the Five-Factor model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 821-830.

Briñol, P., Petty, R. E., Valle, C., Rucker, D. D., & Becerra, A. (2007). The effects of message recipients' power before and after persuasion: A self-validation analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 1040-1053.

Brunell, A. B., Campbell, W. K., Smith, L., & Krusemark, E. A. (2004, January). *Why do people date narcissists? A narrative study*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Austin, TX.

Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 543-545.

Buss, D. M., & Chiodo, L. M. (1991). Narcissistic acts in everyday life. *Journal of Personality*, 59, 179-215.

Campbell, W. K. (1999). Narcissism and romantic attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1254-1270.

Campbell, W. K., Brunell, A. B., & Finkel, E. J. (2006). Narcissism, interpersonal self-regulation, and romantic relationships: An agency model approach. In K. D. Vohs & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Self and relationships: Connecting intrapersonal and interpersonal processes* (pp. 57-83). New York: Guilford.

Campbell, W. K., Bush, C. P., Brunell, A. B., & Shelton, J. (2005). Understanding the social costs of narcissism: The case of the tragedy of the commons. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1358-1368.

Campbell, W. K., & Foster, C. A. (2002). Narcissism and commitment in romantic relationships: An investment model analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 484-495.

Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2, 340-354.

Campbell, W. K., Goodie, A. S., & Foster, J. D. (2004). Narcissism, confidence, and risk attitude. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 17, 297-311.

Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G. D., Sedikides, C., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Narcissism and comparative self-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 34, 329-347.

Carroll, L. (1987). A study of narcissism, affiliation, intimacy, and power motives among students in business administration. *Psychological Reports*, 61(2), 355-358.

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2006, August). *The narcissistic CEO: An exploratory study of indicators and strategic consequences*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Academy of Management, Atlanta, GA.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Deluga, R. J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 49-65.

Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48(3), 291-300.

Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 11-17.

Farwell, L., & Wohlwend-Lloyd, R. (1998). Narcissistic processes: Optimistic expectations, favorable self-evaluations, and self-enhancing attributions. *Journal of Personality*, 66, 65-83.

Foster, J. D., Shrira, I., & Campbell, W. K. (2006). Theoretical models of narcissism, sexuality, and relationship commitment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23, 367-386.

Freud, S. (1921). Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, 24 vols. (Vol. 18, pp. 65-144). London: Hogarth.

Freud, S. (1931). Libidinal types. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21, pp. 217-220). London: Hogarth. (Original work published 1950)

Gabriel, M. T., Critelli, J. W., & Ee, J. S. (1994). Narcissistic illusions in self-evaluations of intelligence and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality*, 62, 143-155.

Gough, H., & Bradley, P. (1992). Delinquent and criminal behavior as assessed by the revised California Psychological Inventory. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 48, 298-308.

Harms, P. D., Wood, D., & Roberts, B. W. (2006). *The role of self-enhancement in leadership appraisals, performance outcomes, and group cohesiveness*. Manuscript under review.

Hayes, A. F. (2006). A primer on multilevel modeling. *Human Communication Research*, 32, 385-410.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49, 493-504.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1/2), 40-51.

John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 206-219.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765-780.

Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the narcissistic personality to self- and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 762-776.

Kenny, D. A., Mannetti, L., Pierro, A., Livi, S., & Kashy, D. A. (2002). The statistical analysis of data from small groups. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 83, 126-137.

Kubarych, T. S., Deary, I. J., & Austin, E. J. (2004). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Factor structure in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 857-872.

Lord, R. G., de Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 402-410.

Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review*, 68-77.

Morf, C. C., & Rhodelwalt, F. (1993). Narcissism and self-evaluation maintenance: Explorations in object relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 668-676.

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 177-196.

Oltmanns, T. F., Friedman, J. N. W., Fiedler, E. R., & Turkheimer, E. (2003). Perceptions of people with personality disorders based on thin slices of behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38, 216-239.

Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1197-1208.

Paulhus, D. L., & John, O. P. (1998). Egoistic and moralistic biases in self-perception: The interplay of self-deceptive styles with basic traits and motives. *Journal of Personality*, 66, 1025-1060.

Paunonen, S. V., Lönnqvist, J. E., Verkasalo, M., Leikas, S., & Nissinen, V. (2006). Narcissism and emergent leadership in military cadets. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 475-486.

Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior. Do bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 126-134

Project IDEELS. (n.d.). *Narg island: The situation*. Available at http://www.ideels.unibremen.de/narg_situation.html

Raskin, R. N., & Novacek, J. (1991). Narcissism and the use of fantasy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 490-499.

Raskin, R. N., Novacek, J., & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissistic self-esteem management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 911-918.

Raskin, R. N., & Shaw, R. (1988). Narcissism and the use of personal pronouns. *Journal of Personality*, 56, 393-404.

Raskin, R. N., & Terry, H. (1988). A principle components analysis of the Narcissitic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 890-902.

Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1995). Self and interpersonal correlates of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory: A review and new findings. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 29, 1-23.

Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1998). On self-aggrandizement and anger: A temporal analysis of narcissism and affective reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 672-685.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 617-633.

Taggar, S., & Hackett, R. (1999). Leadership emergence in autonomous work teams: Antecedents and outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 899-926.

Tormala, Z. L., & Rucker, D. D. (2007). Attitude certainty: A review of past findings and emerging perspectives. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1, 469-492.

Wallace, H. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). The performance of narcissists rises and falls with perceived opportunity for glory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 819-834.

Wasylyshyn, K. M. (2005). The reluctant president. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 57, 57-70.

Watson, P. J., & Biderman, M. D. (1994). Narcissistic traits scale: Validity evidence and sex differences in narcissism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 16, 501-504.

Wink, P., & Gough, H. (1990). New narcissism scales for the California Psychological Inventory and MMPI. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 54, 446-462.